



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,740	12/24/2003	Eiichi Iishi	1422-0619P	9686
2292	7590	10/19/2006	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			HABTE, KAHSAY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TH

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/743,740	Applicant(s) IISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Kahsay Habte	Art Unit 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/11/2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6 are pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment filed 9/11/2006 in response to the previous Office Action (2/23/2006) is acknowledged. Rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) has been maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaspersen *et al.* {Journal of Label. comp. and Radiopharm., 27, No. 9, 1055 (1989)}. Kaspersen *et al.* teaches the multi-step synthesis of Org-3770 (mirtazapine) on page 1058 (Fig.4). On page 1066, Kaspersen *et al.* also teaches the crystallization of the mirtazapine from the crude product using methanol/water solvent mixture to achieve almost pure crystals. Claims 1-3 are product claims, in which applicants recite some of the physical and chemical characteristics of the said product. MPEP 2112 says:

Art Unit: 1624

"SOMETHING WHICH IS OLD DOES NOT BECOME PATENTABLE UPON THE DISCOVERY OF A NEW PROPERTY

The claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977)."

In this case, the "unknown property" is the particular crystalline form with X-ray diffraction pattern and the level of dryness. This is unknown because the reference is silent on this property. MPEP 2112 goes on to state:

"A REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102/103 CAN BE MADE WHEN THE PRIOR ART PRODUCT SEEMS TO BE IDENTICAL EXCEPT THAT THE PRIOR ART IS SILENT AS TO AN INHERENT CHARACTERISTIC

Where applicant claims a composition in terms of a function, property or characteristic and the composition of the prior art is the same as that of the claim but the function is not explicitly disclosed by the reference, the examiner may make a rejection under both 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, expressed as a 102/103 rejection."

Again, the "CHARACTERISTIC" which the prior art is silent on is the crystalline form.

This is not an ordinary inherency situation where it is not explicitly stated what the product actually is. Here the reference explicitly teaches exactly what the compound is. The only difference is a characteristic about which the reference happens to be silent. See also Ex parte Anderson, 21 USPQ 2nd 1241 at 1251.

Applicants are reminded that the PTO has no testing facilities. If applicants' reasoning were accepted, then any anticipation rejection of an old compound could always be overcome by tacking on some characteristic or property which the reference was silent on, regardless of whether the prior art material was any different from the claimed material. For example, if it did not happen to mention the color, one could patent an old compound just by adding "which is green" or "which is not indigo". One could put in a limitation about density (e.g. "density is not 1.4"), melting point, "refractive index of 2.0", solubility in some obscure solvent, spectroscopic data, and then simply point to the silence of the reference, as applicants have done here. Or one could add properties like or "does not explode on tapping" or "in the form of microneedles" or, as here, "crystals have characteristic diffraction peaks in the X-ray diffraction pattern."

Response to arguments

Applicant's argument filed 09/11/2006 has been fully considered but it is not persuasive.

Applicants argue, "Instant claims 5 and 6 recite that the mirtazapine crystals have a melting point of 114-116 °C. This is a distinction to the teaching of Kaspersen et al. which recite that the melting point of the mirtazapine product 1c is 123.8-125.8 °C." The examiner disagrees with applicants. Melting point difference could arise from impurities in the product. It could also arise from human error or instrumentation error. As discussed in the interview with Dr. Garth Dahlen, the only way to prove that the prior art compound is different from the instantly claimed crystal is by replicating Kaspersen and

Art Unit: 1624

show that Kaspersen mirtazapine crystal is different from what is claimed. Applicants have to prove the product from Kaspersen et al. that is dried under ordinary condition would not necessarily provide mirtazapine crystals having (i) a water content of not more than 0.5% by weight and (ii) a hygroscopic degree of not more than 0.6% by weight when the crystals are stored in the air having a relative humidity of 75% at 25°C under atmospheric pressure for 500 hours. Note that Applicant's compound has passed the test (i.e. the hygroscopic degree was not more than 0.6% by weight when the crystals are stored in the air having a relative humidity of 75% at 25°C under atmospheric pressure for 500 hours), but this test was not done on the prior art compound.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1624

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kahsay Habte whose telephone number is (571)-272-0667. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9.00- 5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kahsay Habte
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

October 17, 2006